

REMARKS

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Applicant requests that all of the remarks made in the communication filed 10/13/09, and the supplemental remarks and amendments made herein be fully considered, under 37CFR 1.114, as Applicant submits herewith a Request for Continued Examination, and the appropriate fee.

[0003] The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1, 3-25, 27-49 and 51-65 are currently pending.
- No claims are canceled herein.
- No claims are withdrawn herein.
- Claims 1, 25, and 49 are amended herein.
- No new claims are added herein.

[0004] Support for the amendments to claims is found in the specification at least at page 3, Figure 4, and [0029] – [0030], page 12.

Advisory Action

[0005] Applicant notes, from the Advisory Action mailed 10/30/2009, the Examiner indicates that all of the arguments made in the response filed 10/13/09 are fully addressed by the previous Action (mailed 7/10/09), and that Applicant's argument with regard to figure 3 of Hilbert are not persuasive. Applicant respectfully traverses these assertions.

[0006] For example, neither the Advisory Action, nor the Final Action mailed 7/10/09, address the argument that the Examiner relies upon art to make out the rejection which is not prior art under any of the subsections of 102.

[0007] Applicant reminds the Examiner that MPEP 707.07(f) states "The examiner must, however, address any arguments presented by the applicant which are still relevant to any references being applied."

Lack of *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness (MPEP § 2142)

[0008] Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's obviousness rejections. Arguments presented herein point to various aspects of the record to demonstrate that all of the criteria set forth for making a prima facie case have not been met.

Based upon Hilbert and Enin

[0009] The Examiner rejects claims 1, 6-8, 10-12, 14-19, 21, 23-25, 31-32, 34-36, 38-43, 45, 47-49, 54-56, 58-63, 65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hilbert in view of Enin. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

[0010] The rejection relies upon teachings from a web page hosted by Simtel.net as extrinsic evidence of what one of ordinary skill in the art would have known about Batch Launcher (aka Enin) at the time the invention was made.

[0011] The Examiner has not introduced into the record, any disclosure from Enin, which would teach or suggest the claimed features for which it is relied, nor has the Examiner pointed out with particularity how disclosure from Enin corresponds to the claimed features as required by MPEP 706.02(j), which states "the examiner should set forth in the Office action:

(A) the relevant teachings of the prior art relied upon, preferably with reference to the relevant column or page number(s) and line number(s) where appropriate,".

[0012] Applicant reiterates, that what appears in the web page hosted by Simtel.net (describing Enin) does not appear until Feb 28, 2007, which is more than 3 years after the filing date of the instant application. Thus, the Examiner fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness for each claim in which Enin is used to reject the claims. Specifically, Applicant notes Enin is relied upon for teaching the claimed:

- "a start control that is user-selectable to initiate that multiple application programs start together at approximately a same time after the transition to the desktop page and after a single user input",

[0013] yet the Examiner has provided nothing from Enin, such as a prior dated screen shot, description, or operation manual, to teach this claimed feature.

[0014] Absent such, each of the claims as presented, even prior to amendment made herein has not been shown to have been obviated.

[0015] In addition to the forgoing, Applicant submits the following, and asks the Examiner fully consider all arguments presented.

Independent Claim 1

[0016] Without conceding the rejection of the claim, Applicant amends independent claim 1 herein. Applicant submits that the combination of Hilbert and Enin does not teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim as amended (with emphasis added):

- a logon page which is displayed to the user prior to logging onto the computing system, the logon page including:
 - one or more selectable logon controls; and
 - one or more user-identifiable indicators corresponding to the user, wherein each displayed user-identifiable indicator is associated with its corresponding selectable logon control displayed on the logon page;
- a user-configurable on-line selectable control on the user interface start page which permits the user to designate an on-line status before transitioning to the desktop page, wherein the user is permitted via the user-configurable on-line selectable control to select a status wherein at least one other user is not notified that the user has changed status from off-line to on-line

[0017] Applicant submits that neither Hilbert nor Enin teach or combine to suggest these features as amended herein.

[0018] Applicant notes that Hilbert Figure 3, shows, at best, a user interface that scans a user's electronic tag which bears the name "Toru". Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to readily distinguish between this disclosure in Hilbert and the claimed feature noted above.

[0019] Furthermore, Applicant amends claim 1 herein to recite that the start page includes the "a user-configurable on-line selectable control" noted above. Applicant notes this feature is not taught or suggested by the combination of Hilbert and Enin, as neither reference alludes to on-line status or online selectable controls.

[0020] Consequently, as shown above, the combination of Hilbert and Enin a) does not establish a prima facie case due to reliance upon teaching from non-prior art and b) does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 3-24

[0021] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim, which depends from an allowable base claim, is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Independent Claim 25

[0022] Without conceding the rejection of the claim, Applicant amends independent claim 25 herein. Applicant submits that the combination of Hilbert and Enin is both improper and does not teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

- displaying, on a display device, a logon page to the user, the logon page including a user-identifiable indicator corresponding to the user, wherein the user-identifiable indicator is associated with a selectable logon control displayed on the logon page, wherein the selectable logon control that is displayed on the logon page is selectable via a user input to the computing system;
- ..., and wherein the user interface start page is further configured to display a user-configurable on-line selectable control on the user interface start page which permits the user to designate an on-line status before transitioning to

the desktop page, wherein the user is permitted via the user-configurable on-line selectable control to select a status wherein at least one other user is not notified that the user has changed status from off-line to on-line

[0023] Applicant submits that neither Hilbert, nor Enin, nor their combination teaches the claimed logon page as recited above. Hilbert teaches a selection of different methods to access a device, such as scanning a user's electronic tag, by key entry, or by biometric measurements (para. [0054]), however none of these would be considered by one of ordinary skill in the art, to be an equivalent to the claimed "selectable logon control displayed on a logon page".

[0024] Furthermore, Applicant amends claim 25 herein to recite that the start page includes the "a user-configurable on-line selectable control" noted above. Applicant notes this feature is not taught or suggested by the combination of Hilbert and Enin, as neither reference alludes to on-line status or online selectable controls.

[0025] Consequently, as shown above, the combination of Hilbert and Enin a) does not establish a prima facie case due to reliance upon teaching from non-prior art and b) does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 27-48

[0026] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 25. As discussed above, claim 25 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim, which depends from an allowable base claim, is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Independent Claim 49

[0027] Without conceding the rejection of the claim, Applicant amends independent claim 49 herein. Applicant submits that the combination of Hilbert and Enin is both improper and does not teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- display a logon page to the user, the logon page including a user-identifiable indicator corresponding to the user, wherein the user-identifiable indicator is associated with a selectable logon control displayed on the logon page, wherein the selectable logon control that is displayed on the logon page is selectable via a user input to the computing system with a mouse click input, and wherein the user-identifiable indicator is a scalable image;
- display a user interface start page in response to user selection of the selectable logon control via the logon page, the user interface start page displayed to the user after a first transition from the logon page but prior to a second transition to a desktop page, wherein the user interface start page and the desktop page each include the user-identifiable indicator corresponding to the user, in varying scale, and wherein the user-identifiable indicator is displayed uninterrupted throughout the first transition and throughout the second transition;
- display a user-configurable on-line selectable control on the user interface start page which permits the user to designate an on-line status before transitioning to the desktop page, wherein the user is permitted via the user-configurable on-line selectable control to select a status wherein at least one other user is not notified that the user has changed status from off-line to on-line

[0028] Applicant submits that neither Hilbert, nor Enin, nor their combination teaches the claimed logon page as recited above. Hilbert teaches a selection of different methods to access a device, such as scanning a user's electronic tag, by key entry, or by biometric measurements (para. [0054]), however none of these would be considered by one of ordinary skill in the art, to be an equivalent to the claimed "selectable logon control displayed on a logon page".

[0029] Furthermore, neither reference, nor their combination teaches or suggests the use of a "scalable image" displayed on a logon page, as claimed by virtue of the amendment made herein.

[0030] Further still, Applicant amends claim 49 herein to recite that the start page includes the "a user-configurable on-line selectable control" noted above. Applicant notes this feature is not taught or suggested by the combination of Hilbert and Enin, as neither reference alludes to on-line status or online selectable controls.

[0031] Consequently, as shown above, the combination of Hilbert and Enin a) does not establish a prima facie case due to reliance upon teaching from non-prior art and b) does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 51-65

[0032] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 49. As discussed above, claim 49 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim, which depends from an allowable base claim, is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Conclusion

[0033] In light of the forgoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited. Should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, they are invited to telephone or e-mail the undersigned.

[0034] In addition, it is believed that all of the pending claims have been fully addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed.

[0035] Finally, nothing in this communication should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this communication, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Randall T. Palmer 61440/
Randall T. Palmer
(randy@leehayes.com; 509-944-4761)
Registration No. 61440

Dated: 11/10/09

Rob Peck
(robp@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)
Registration No. 56826